COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON DC 20004-2401 TEL 202 662 6000 FAX 202 662 6291 WWW COV.COM BEIJING BRUSSELS LONDON NEW YORK SAN DIEGO SAN FRANCISCO SHI ICON YAL_FY WASHINGTON

MICHAEL L. ROSENTHAL, TEL 202 662 5448 FAX 202 778 5448 MROSENTHAL & COV.COM

July 20, 2010

227457

227459

30 2 0 2010

Latin of

BY HAND

Ms. Cynthia T. Brown Chief, Section of Administration Office of Proceedings Surface Transportation Board 395 E Street, SW Washington, DC 20423

Re:

Docket No. 42104, Entergy Arkansas, Inc. and Entergy Services, Inc. v. Union Pacific Railroad Company and Missouri & Northern Arkansas Railroad Company, Inc. and BNSF Railway Company
Finance Docket No. 32187, Missouri & Northern Arkansas Railroad Company, Inc. – Lease, Acquisition and Operation Exemption - Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and Burlington Northern Railroad Company

Dear Ms. Brown:

Enclosed for filing are an original and ten copies of Union Pacific's Request for Oral Argument.

An additional paper copy of this filing is also enclosed. Please return a date-stamped copy to our messenger.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Ruenthal Dm

Enclosures

cc: Parties of Record

BEFORE THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD



ENTERGY ARKANSAS, INC. and ENTERGY SERVICES, INC., Complainants,

v.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY and MISSOURI & NORTHERN ARKANSAS RAILROAD COMPANY, INC. and BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY, Defendants.

MISSOURI & NORTHERN ARKANSAS R.R. – LEASE, ACQUISITION AND OPERATION EXEMPTION – MISSOURI PACIFIC R.R. and BURLINGTON NORTHERN R.R.

227457 Docket No. 42104

Office of Proveedings

UL 20 2010

Part of ublic Record

227459 Finance Docket No. 32187

UNION PACIFIC'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Union Pacific Railroad Company hereby requests that the Surface Transportation Board schedule an oral argument in this case. The rebuttal evidence filed by the complainants and the intervenor contains many misstatements of fact and fallacious arguments. However, the current procedural schedule does not allow us an opportunity to address these issues in a brief, and we do not want to prolong this case by filing motions to strike or sur-rebuttal. An oral argument would allow us efficiently to identify errors in the rebuttal evidence, and it would allow the Board to ask the parties any questions that may remain after reviewing the evidence. Because this proceeding involves multiple parties on both sides of the issue, we respectfully suggest that the Board consider allocating more than the standard 20 minutes per side in oral argument.

Respectfully submitted,

J. MICHAEL HEMMER GAYLA L. THAL LOUISE A. RINN Union Pacific Railroad Company 1400 Douglas Street Omaha, Nebraska 68179

Telephone: (402) 544-4831 Facsimile: (402) 544-0127

MICHAEL L. ROSENTHAL CHARLES H.P. VANCE Covington & Burling LLP

1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004 Telephone: (202) 662-6000 Facsimile: (202) 662-6291

Attorneys for Union Pacific Railroad Company

July 20, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Michael L. Rosenthal, certify that on this 20th day of July, 2010, I caused copies of Union Pacific's Request for Oral Argument to be served on counsel for the parties of record as follows:

By email and hand delivery:

C. Michael Loftus, Esq. Frank J. Pergolizzi, Esq. Andrew B. Kolesar III, Esq. Slover & Loftus 1224 Seventeenth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

Eric A. Von Salzen, Esq. Alex Menendez, Esq. McLeod, Watkinson & Miller One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20001

Adrian L. Steel, Jr., Esq. Mayer Brown LLP 1999 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006-1101

By email and overnight courier:

Louis E. Gitomer, Esq. The Adams Building, Suite 301 600 Baltimore Avenue Towson, MD 21204-4022

Michael L. Rosenthal DM